

VU Research Portal

Organizational culture - Volume 1

Ybema, S.B.; Yanow, D.; Sabelis, I.H.J.

2011

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Ybema, S. B., Yanow, D., & Sabelis, I. H. J. (Eds.) (2011). *Organizational culture - Volume 1*. (The International Library of Critical Writings on Business and Management; No. 15). Edward Elgar.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Introduction

Dvora Yanow and Sierk Ybema

The field known today as 'organizational culture' burst onto the organizational studies scene at the beginning of the 1980s, for specific contemporaneous reasons, with the publication of several key books and special issues of journals. Yet interest in processes of meaning-making in organizational and management studies did not begin only then. There is much work predating the naming of the field that sought to explain the phenomena that it engages, including some that drew explicitly on the concept of culture to give an account of organizational elements. Although, given its name, one might expect the field to have drawn heavily on anthropological literature, the sources that fed it were, in fact, as wide-ranging as the fields that influence organizational studies research itself: bureaucracy theory, sociology, psychology and social psychology, political science, and so on. The range of scholarly influences is reflected in the various forerunners that preceded the rather sudden emergence of the field of study called 'organizational culture.'

I. Forerunners

Given the roots of organizational studies – whether conducted within business and/or management schools and departments, sociology (in the 'Sociology of Organizations'), psychology (in 'Organizational Psychology') or political science, public policy, and public administration – in studies of bureaucratic forms of organization, it should not be surprising that many of what could be called the forerunners of organizational culture directed their attention to bureaucracies of various forms. One finds attention to belief systems, symbolic acts, meaning-making, myths, rituals, and so forth in the early works of Philip Selznick (*TVA and the Grass Roots*, 1949; *Leadership in Administration*, 1957); Alvin Gouldner (*Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, 1954; *Wildcat Strike*, 1955); Peter Blau (*The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*, 1955); Herbert Kaufman (*The Forest Ranger*, 1960); Michel Crozier (*The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, 1964); and others. Other books attended to meaning-making in managing and working on the shop floor, such as Elliott Jaques (*The Changing Culture of a Factory*, 1951), Donald Roy (in a series of articles; see, e.g., 1954); Melville Dalton (*Men Who Manage*, 1959), and Barry A. Turner (*Exploring the Industrial Subculture*, 1971).

Excerpting all of these fascinating works is not possible for reasons of space, and so we have selected passages from four of them that seem historically significant and/or anticipate key themes developed in later organizational culture studies. Elliott Jaques (vol. I, #1) deserves credit for introducing the concept of culture into the field of organizational studies. His 1951 report on a study of a factory conducted by the Tavistock Institute defined culture as 'the traditional way of thinking and of doing things' (Jaques 1951: 251). Alvin Gouldner's classic study of a gypsum mine (vol. I, #2), from 1954, represents the rich variety of post-war fieldwork exploring the workings of bureaucratic organizations. His fine-grained descriptions of the everyday dynamics of the control—resistance dialectic that played out between a new, 'punishment-centered' management and mine workers who were used to working under more lenient rules beautifully illustrate the merits of a perspective that places the politics of sensemaking at centre stage. We could equally as well have drawn on Philip Selznick's 1949 analysis of the Tennessee Valley Authority, but we have opted for passages from his later book (vol. I, #3) as it anticipates a central focus of organizational culture studies: the role of leaders and leadership in creating, shaping, and changing organizational cultures. Barry Turner's 1971 book (vol. I, #4) emerged from the Management Control Project in industrial sociology directed by Joan Woodward (1970). Turner begins by observing the limitations of existing forms of research for garnering insight into meaning-making due to their level of abstraction from lived experience, a theme he would develop later as one of the central thinkers exploring organizational symbolism (see vol. II, #43). In the excerpt here, he explores symbolic meanings, both overt and covert, that in his view are characteristic of organizational subcultures and which are expressed through rituals, language, and other modes of communication.

II. Organizational culture as a 'new paradigm'

In looking at the academic literature that, rather suddenly and simultaneously, launched this new field a decade after Turner published his study of the industrial subculture, it seems that something must have been bubbling beneath the surface that gave rise to 'organizational culture' as a new way of seeing and understanding

organizational life. It is commonplace in narratives of this history to point to the threat posed by the growing Japanese dominance of traditionally US enterprises. But whereas this might well explain the development of the 'corporate culture' school among American business consultants, which we take up in Part III, it does not provide a satisfactory account, in our view, of developments in the academy worldwide, where culture was being heralded as a new 'paradigm'.

We use this term advisedly, as in our view, it is not possible to separate this 'new' way of seeing and understanding organizations from developments taking place in other areas within the social sciences, some of it concerning this very term. In the US in particular, the 1960s and 1970s had seen the rise of behavioralism which, together with the development of survey research and statistical science, fueled by the increasing capacity of computers to process ever larger amounts of data and their miniaturization into desktop form, facilitated the growth of quantitative analyses of organizational behavior. Older, Chicago-School style participant-observer or ethnographic studies of work and organizations, such as those described above and excerpted in Part I, fell off precipitously among journal publications between the 1950s-early 60s and the 1970s-90s, at least as reflected in the first 40 volumes of *Administrative Science Quarterly* (Van Maanen 1987: xviii). It is not unreasonable to consider the growth of academic organizational culture studies as a humanistic response to the behavioralist challenge.

Furthermore, new thinking in the philosophy of (social) science and the sociology of knowledge began to make inroads into organizational studies, and the organizational culture field – indeed, the very concept and approach – reflected this confluence of ideas. Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970 [1962]) sparked a new look by historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers at processes of knowledge production. The structures of scientific disciplines, Kuhn argued, rested on "paradigms," which he used to refer both to the set of ideas or theories shared throughout a discipline and to what today we might call the "epistemic community" of scientists sharing these ideas or theories (the idea of the 'hermeneutic circle'), as well as the procedures for investigating them. This notion was taken up within organizational studies by the influential *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis* by Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan (1979). Morgan extended the notion of perspectival knowledge in his subsequent book, *Images of Organization* (1986), analyzing various metaphors which suffused theories about organizations. Contemporaneous with the introduction of Kuhn's ideas, the publication of Berger and Luckmann's *The Social Construction of Reality* (1966) brought phenomenological ideas, in particular the work of Alfred Schütz, to English-language readers. Exposure to other late 18th-early 19th century Continental philosophers, including Hans Georg Gadamer, Paul Ricoeur, Martin Heidegger, Jürgen Habermas, and others articulating meaning-focused social theories, had a growing impact on thinking across the social sciences in North America. And cultural and symbolic anthropology, which had long focused on situated sense-making and local knowledge, began to exert its influence as well, in particular through the writings of Clifford Geertz, whose 1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures* was quickly taken up in fields ranging from business to urban studies. Anthropologists also started focusing on the ways in which academic texts themselves (as well as museum exhibits) are "ways of worldmaking" (in Nelson Goodman's phrase, 1978), producing the social realities of the field site as much as, perhaps even more than, they reflected them (see Clifford and Marcus 1986, Geertz 1988, and Van Maanen 1988). At the same time, feminist scholars were developing 'standpoint theory': the idea that knowledge is not produced from some "God's-eye point of view" or "view from nowhere" (Haraway 1988, Harding 1993), but that observation and analysis are situated – made from within the subject of study. This led to a concern with what methodologists now call "positionality" – a reflexive self-awareness of the researcher's particular phenomenological background (prior education, training, experience, personal-family-communal-etc. background), as well as specific location (geographic, hierarchical) within a study, that together shape what the researcher can observe and learn and, hence, the situation-specific knowledge she or he can generate.

These several influences sensitized social scientists to social, political, and other aspects of their claims to knowledge and the processes of its production. Organizational studies scholars began to reclaim the ethnographic and other qualitative methods that had characterized earlier bureaucracy, work, and workplace studies. In 1979 John Van Maanen edited a special issue of *Administrative Science Quarterly* devoted to qualitative research; almost a decade later, Jones, Moore, and Snyder (1988: 18) discussed 'organizational ethnography' as a particular methodological form appropriate for the study of organizational cultures and their symbolic manifestations.

All of this came to fruition within organizational studies with the publication of Andrew M. Pettigrew's (1979) 'On Studying Organizational Cultures' (vol. I, #5). Although the 1983 *Administrative Science Quarterly* special issue on organizational culture, edited by Mariann Jellinek, Linda Smircich, and Paul Hirsch, is widely thought of as having launched the academic field of organizational culture studies, Pettigrew's insightful article is

the earliest work we have found that specifically takes up the ideas that Jaques had initiated 28 years earlier: that ‘culture’ and ‘symbolism’ play a role in shaping what happens in organizational life. A 1982 article considered the relationships among information technologies, organizational culture, and office design (Olson 1982), although without much discussion of what ‘organizational culture’ is or means. But it was the *ASQ* Special Issue, and in particular Linda Smircich’s essay in it, reproduced here (vol. I, #6), that for many scholars framed the idea of culture in organizations, providing a taxonomy that continued to be a touchstone for some time. Equally significant was Edgar Schein’s work, published initially in a series of articles (one included here as vol. I, #7; see also vol. I, #18) and leading to the now-classic *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (1985, 1992). Having studied anthropology with Clyde Kluckhohn at Harvard in the late 1940s, Schein took an approach to culture – seeing assumptions as deeper, more foundational structures upon which values and then artifacts rested – that can be read as reflecting the (structural-)functionalism embedded in earlier anthropological theories.

The three articles included in this section represent the foundations of the more academic engagement with the ideas of organizational culture. The field developed rapidly in the first few years of the 1980s, through conferences and the publication of additional journal special issues, edited collections, monographs, and textbooks. In North America, Louis Pondy convened a gathering at his home in 1979 on organizational symbolism, resulting in the publication of a set of papers exploring symbolic aspects of organizational life (Pondy, Frost, Morgan, and Dandridge 1983). In 1983 the University of British Columbia in Vancouver hosted a gathering that resulted in the publication of *Organizational Culture*, followed later by *Reframing Organizational Culture* (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, and Martin 1985, 1991). Michael Owen Jones and David Boje organized a conference at UCLA on “Myth, Symbol, and Folklore: Expanding the Analysis of Organizations,” also in 1983, leading eventually to the publication of *Inside Organizations* (Jones, Moore, and Snyder, 1988; see also Jones 1996). A later workshop convened in 1992 by Caren Siehl at Arizona State University—West gathered a group of scholars who were teaching organizational culture. Meanwhile, on the other side of the Atlantic, SCOS – the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism, a study group of the European Group on Organizational Studies – begun in 1982, held its first ‘international’ conference in 1984. Those gatherings resulted in at least two volumes of collected papers, *Organizational Symbolism* (Turner 1990) and *Symbols and Artifacts* (Gagliardi 1990), and many more journal articles. Following on the heels of the *ASQ* special issues came others: the *Journal of Management* (1985, 11:2), *Journal of Management Studies* (1986, 23:3), *Organization Studies* (1986, 7:2), *International Studies of Management and Organization* (1987, 17:3), to name a few. Other early monographs, edited collections, and overviews included Allaire and Firsirotu (1984), Davis (1984), Sergiovanni and Corbally (1984), Sathe (1985), and Kilmann et al. (1985).

The field began with a certain playfulness, evident especially in SCOS papers and meetings and in the two Frost et al. volumes. There was, however, a very serious side to it: in addition to extensive concern with leadership or management and culture (e.g., Sergiovanni and Corbally 1984, Schein 1985, Smircich and Morgan 1982), including a feminist critique of the same (Calás and Smircich 1991), scholars explored how organizational culture related to strategy (e.g., Smircich and Stubbart 1985), mergers and acquisitions (Nahavandi and Malekzadeh 1988), and globalization (Smircich and Calás 1993), among other topics. Allied fields, such as organizational communication and organizational climate, also analyzed their synergies and differences with the definitions and concerns of organizational culture studies (e.g., Bormann 1983, Schneider 1990). By the early 1990s and continuing today, major textbooks in organizational studies included at least one chapter devoted to organizational culture and its concerns – Clegg, Kornberger, and Pitsis (2005), Czarniawska-Joerges (1992), Handel (2004), Hatch (1997; Hatch and Cunliffe 2007), McAuley, Duberley, and Johnson (2007), Shafritz and Ott (1996; Shafritz, Ott, and Jang, 2004) – some of them taking both culture and symbolism as their core subjects – Alvesson (2002), Alvesson and Berg (1992), Brown (1995), Martin (2002), and Trice and Beyer (1993).

III. ‘Corporate culture’ as a tool of management

At the same time that academic engagement with these ideas was developing, concerns in the US sparked by the rapid growth of the Japanese automobile and steel industries and the concomitant decline of their American counterparts, long a mainstay of US industry, led many – especially those with a practitioner’s or consultant’s orientation to management – to search for explanations. Focusing on the much heralded “Japanese management style,” these analyses zeroed in on the idea that “culture” and its components play a central role in organizational life. William Ouchi, then at Stanford Business School, created “Theory Z” (1981; represented here by an earlier article co-authored with Alfred M. Jaeger, vol. I, #8), a counterpart to Douglas McGregor’s (1960) “Theory X” and “Theory Y”, to describe what Japanese managers brought to the table that American managers were missing (see also Pascale and Athos 1981). Terrence Deal, then at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Allen Kennedy, at McKinsey Consulting, teamed up to explore what, in their view, generated the success of the top

earning companies in the US: the symbols, rituals, ceremonies, and other elements that comprised ‘corporate culture’ (vol. I, #9). Thomas J. Peters and Robert Waterman, also at McKinsey, similarly searched for sources of ‘excellence’ in the leadership of those companies at the top of their game at that time (vol. I, #10).

Their and others’ best-selling books promoted corporate culture as a promising tool for organizations striving for better performance. They defined culture in terms of such shared values as customer service, quality, flexibility, and innovation and posited that these could be enhanced by creating and enhancing a number of “cultural” elements: myths, rites, heroes, stories, and so on. They posited that the greater the number of such elements, the ‘stronger’ the culture (without, however, ever defining ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ cultures or providing empirical evidence to support those claims). Culture, in this view, was the ultimate solution to problems of organizational change, replacing other ideas that had proved insufficient for understanding and improving organizational performance.

In adding ‘culture’ to the managerial toolkit and breaking with ‘rational management’ and its emphasis on structures, rules, and procedures, the corporate culture school took its place in the tradition of employee-centered approaches to management ranging from the Hawthorne studies of the 1930s (e.g., Roethlisburger and Dixon 1939) to McGregor’s (1960) and beyond. Its emphasis on the instrumental use and control of “soft” tools continued subtle forms of managerial control proposed by scholars within that tradition which targeted workers’ personhood, motivation, and social relations (on this point, see, e.g., Barley and Kunda 1992). The ‘corporate culture’ approach can, in fact, be seen as a refinement and ambitious extension of such approaches, intended, much as they were, to re-design the worker (rather than the work) by winning over people’s hearts and minds (Grey 2005: 68), achieving control through consent and increasing levels of productivity through members’ intense identification with their employing organization (Willmott 1993).

However, although organizational culture became a central concept in both consultant and academic communities, the term did not have the same meaning in both worlds (Barley, Meyer, and Gash 1988). While both approached culture as a novel concept that focused attention on the social implications of shared interpretations, many within the first group turned to it as a way of improving organizational effectiveness, whereas for many in the second, ‘culture’ came increasingly to stand in for a different ontological and epistemological position, one that broke with the positivist paradigm that dominated organizational studies and its attendant methods. For the latter group, doing organizational culture studies was an act of academic resistance, even to the point of signaling membership on the radical fringe of the discipline. The differences between the perspectives and the premises on which they were built raised questions that profoundly influenced the academic debate in subsequent years. Should culture be seen as a manageable and measurable variable or as a ‘root metaphor’ (Smircich 1983, #6)? What were the central attributes of organizational cultures that generated a sustained competitive advantage and superior financial performance (Barney 1986)? Was it possible to gain control of a corporate culture (Kilmann et al. 1985) and mould and manage an organization’s cultural outlook (Anthony 1994)? If that were tried, what might be the consequences of such attempts (Kunda 1992; Willmott 1992)? Are organizations breeding grounds for sentiments of solidarity or should they rather be regarded as battlegrounds dominated by ideological and political struggles?

Two critical perspectives developed within the field. One tackled the question of whether an organization ‘had’ a single culture and critiqued the assumption that culture tends to enhance social cohesion in organizations. This is reflected in the selections in Part IV. The other questioned the corporate culture school’s insistence that management could use culture to control employees, critiquing the indoctrination presumably gained through the normative control devices of managing culture. This is taken up in Part V.

IV. Organizational culture: Unity, conflict or complexity?

The question of unity or division – whether an organization was or had a single culture or multiple cultures – quickly became a central theme in the academic literature (see, e.g., Frost et al. 1991, Martin and Frost 1996). While some academics and most consultants and practitioners depicted culture in unitary terms – as members of an organization holding shared basic assumptions (Schein 1985) or characterized by singular, shared values, social cohesion, and a hard-working attitude (e.g., Deal and Kennedy 1982, Peters and Waterman 1982) – many academics argued, instead, that organizations potentially house a variety of different, and at times even competing, cultures, rather than a single, monolithic culture (e.g., Gregory 1983, Louis 1985, Lucas 1987, Martin and Siehl 1983, Morey and Luthans 1985, Riley 1983, Sackmann 1992).

This binomial thinking about culture as marked by either unity or conflict was challenged by scholars attending to the complexities and ambiguities of cultural boundaries and the dynamic and diverse character of social and cultural networks (e.g., Alvesson 1993, Hannerz 1992, Koot et al. 1996, Martin 1992, Parker 2000, Sackmann 1997a, Ybema 1996, Young 1989). John Van Maanen and Stephen Barley (vol. I, #11) outlined a

variety of potential sources of cultural difference within an organization. They pointed out that classic studies by Whyte (1948), Selznick (1949), Homans (1950), Gouldner (1954), Blau (1955), and Dalton (1959) depicted organizations as fraught with conflicts of interest fought out among groups with divergent ideologies and interpretations: 'Culture, as invented by various groups of an organization, was found [by the authors of these studies] to be a differentiating, rather than an integrating, mechanism' (Van Maanen and Barley 1985: 39).

Organizations, in this view, should be seen as a 'nexus' of cultures, as argued by Joanne Martin in various works (represented here by Meyerson and Martin 1987, vol. I, #12), where broader, societal, 'feeder cultures' (Louis 1985) come together. From this perspective, scholars needed to acknowledge that culture was best seen as 'existing' on different levels at the same time (Sackmann 1997b); they would do better to approach the field using different perspectives at the same time (Alvesson 1993), highlighting 'integration' and 'differentiation' as well as 'fragmentation' perspectives among and on cultures (Martin 1992, Martin and Meyerson 1988, Meyerson and Martin 1987).

There is some confusion in Martin's work over whether integration, differentiation, and fragmentation are characteristics of organizational cultures or of researchers' perceptions and presentations of those cultures. Ed Young's analysis of a British organization, included here (vol. I, #13), is often treated and categorized as a study written from a differentiation perspective (see, e.g., Frost et al. 1991, Martin 1992: 99). But this constitutes a misreading of his intended meaning. His work is, in fact, an argument for how unity and division 'exist in tandem' (Young 1979: 188; see also Ybema 1996; 1997), drawing on anthropological theories that engage the possible multiplicity of symbolic meanings (Cohen 1985: 15-21, Kertzer 1988: 11).

V. Organizational culture: Control, conformity, and resistance

The second issue intensely debated in academic studies of organizational culture was the contention, advanced by the authors represented in Part III, that the organization's ideals, norms, and values, materialized in their symbolic representations, were powerful tools for enhancing organizational effectiveness. Critical scholars not only questioned the assumption that cultures were and should be unitary and would increase effectiveness, leading ultimately to success (a criticism supported when many of Peters and Waterman's 'excellent' firms landed in economic trouble by the end of the decade after their book was first published). They also took issue with the very notion of culture being managed, moulded or modelled like clay, amenable to control and intervention (see, e.g., Alvesson 1992, Anthony 1994).

Gideon Kunda's detailed ethnographic study (vol. I, #14) of the lived experiences of members of an organization that used explicit and extensive cultural management programs showed instances of organizational members distancing themselves from, as well as embracing, the member roles prescribed for them by the culture. His analysis addressed head on the work of those – corporate culture consultants, in particular – who posited that organizational cultures could be engineered. In addition to providing an example of the power of ethnography for the study of organizational life, his work showed how the values promoted by management were taken up by employees and used in their everyday discourse and practices in more mixed and ambiguous ways than the advocates of control via the management of culture had suggested would be the case.

While studies such as Kunda's describe how managers and professionals working in white collar organizations are affected by normative control and culture management, other studies of control and resistance have investigated situations of managerial domination of the working classes. Some empirical studies have revealed how managerial attempts to create a corporate culture of, for instance, 'customer service' become bogged down when employees conform only superficially to its norms, smiling at customers only when the cameras are on (Ogbonna and Wilkinson 1988), for example. This suggests the continuing relevance of the classic distinctions between front and back regions (Goffman 1959), overt and covert meanings (Turner 1971; see vol. I, #4), or official and unofficial culture, as John Jermier, John Slocum, Louis Fry, and Jeannie Gaines note (vol. I, #15). Their study of organizational subcultures and David Collinson's of workplace culture (vol. I, #16) show how employees conformed to, modified or resisted the official culture stipulated by top management. Together with Kunda's and with other scholars' studies of Japanese subsidiaries in Western countries (e.g., Delbridge 1998, Graham 1995, Sharpe 1997), they illustrate how employees can also subjugate or subvert efforts to control them.

Another theorist drawing attention to the darker sides of culture management, Hugh Willmott (vol. I, #17) likened instances of extreme normative control within organizations to the totalitarian society George Orwell described in 1984. He found parallels in Orwell's emphasis on communal parties (see, e.g., Rosen vol. II, #49), the patriarchal dictator ('Big Brother'), the language ('Newspeak'), and the slogans ('freedom is slavery'), all of them working to strengthen the collective by inviting or seducing the individual to wholeheartedly align him- or herself with the company's goals.

VI. Creating and changing organizational cultures

While debates about simplistic notions of unitary cultures or unethical implications of culture as a tool of management continued, more sophisticated ideas about cultural change also developed. Both academics and practitioners have shown a sustained interest in the subject of the creation of cultures and the ability of organizations to change their existing culture(s). In his writings Edgar Schein has laid a theoretical and empirical foundation for the thought that, on the one hand, organizational founders and leaders have a profound influence in creating and shaping an organizational culture, whereas, on the other hand, once a culture has settled in, it becomes increasingly difficult for new generations of leaders to change it (vol. I, #18). When, for instance, a founder's democratic leadership style with its consensus-based decision-making has become established, organizational members continue to demand the opportunity to discuss every decision that needs to be made, even when the size of an organization hardly permits participation and new circumstances demand decisive action (cf. Greiner 1972). In this view of culture, it is not so much an easy opportunity for managers to control an organization as it is an evolutionary process that can pose huge obstacles for management to surmount.

Schein's ideas have played a significant role in founding and theorizing the field of organizational culture, but other theorists have not adopted his ideas in the pattern Schein suggests happens with organizational founders and followers. Being a central figure in the organizational culture field made him a standard with respect to whom others positioned their own work, contesting his views on several points. Some of these challenged his views of leadership as privileging the culture-shaping influence of a few top executives while ignoring subcultural diversity and countercultural movements (see, e.g., Martin 1992). Mary Jo Hatch (vol. I, #19), among others (e.g., Koot 1996, Tennekes 1995), argued that Schein's view of culture as residing in taken-for-granted, hard-to-change 'basic assumptions' treats culture as a stabilizing mechanism – characteristic of anthropological scholarship, in some views (Yanow 1993) – rather than as a more fluid process. In order to capture the dynamics of culture in processes of organizing, Hatch introduced a model of cultural change, described in the article reproduced here.

On the assumption that cultural processes can, in fact, be influenced, consultants and researchers have developed interventionist perspectives on cultural change, usually building on one typology or another of organizational cultures (e.g., Handy 1985, Quinn and McGrath 1985) or model of cultural change (e.g., Lundberg 1985, Gagliardi 1986). Interestingly, Paul Bate (vol. I, #20) provides an interventionist's approach to cultural change in his book *Strategies for cultural change* that tries to acknowledge the complexities of culture, resisting, as he puts it, the 'siren-call of the simplifiers' and refusing to offer 'an eight-point guide to "excellence" or a single two-by-two matrix of strategic options for change' (pp. 4-5 in the original). In developing different strategies for cultural change, he adopts an anthropological perspective on culture, suggesting that consultants should 'think culturally' when intervening in processes of organizing. Mats Alvesson takes up this theme in the concluding chapter of his book *Understanding organizational culture* (vol. I, #21). Rather than developing strategies for change, however, Alvesson questions a variety of taken-for-granted assumptions in the literature on culture and change, summarizing some of the major fallacies in change-focused culture-thinking.

VII. The management of meaning, the meaning of management

In retrospect, it is clear that a goodly part of the consideration of cultural dimensions of organizational life was a surrogate for a methodological paradigm turn struggling to emerge within organizational studies. Where heretofore the debate in the field had been about defining 'organization' in order to theorize it – was it a structure, a net of human relations, a system, a set of political relationships? – the cultural lens, as invoked and enacted by many academic theorists, meant a hermeneutic-phenomenological shift toward a more meaning-focused, constructivist, interpretive ontological and epistemological stance. From such a perspective, it was 'natural' that cultural meanings could be multiple and that different people (organizational members and researchers alike) could interpret meanings in different ways. This other position saw the critique of unitary views of organizational culture (Part IV) and the symbolic dimensions of cultures (Parts XI-XIII) as elemental.

As part of this paradigm shift, management or leadership were seen as activities that involve defining 'organizational realities' and managing meanings. Jeffrey Pfeffer captured that shift toward meaning in treating management as symbolic action (vol. I, #22). He emphasized the reality-defining powers of management action, visible when one assumes that such action has a far-reaching influence on developing shared understandings within an organization, itself helping to avoid conflict, resistance, and frustration. Linda Smircich and Gareth Morgan took a similar approach in engaging leadership as the management of meaning (vol. I, #23). They argue that leaders need to recognize this meaning-shaping aspect of their role, which they would do through acknowledging situational ambiguities and multiple interpretations and themselves embodying the values and meanings they wished to see enacted by others within their organizations.

Other authors have taken an even broader view, situating the meaning of management within its wider societal context. Some have depicted management as, for instance, constituted around the values of hierarchy, accountability, and achievement and characterized by the language of rationalization, efficiency, and predictability (Gowler and Legge 1983; Linstead et al. 1996) that are prevalent throughout a society's institutions. Such approaches gave rise to the kinds of arguments advanced by the Critical Management Studies (CMS) and Discourse groups (the CMS Workshop, based in England, and the CMS Interest Group at the Academy of Management; the ongoing Organizational Discourse Conference, moving between London and Amsterdam). Included here as an example of this line of thinking, Virginia Ingersoll and Guy Adams (vol. I, #24) argue that a set of values – rational-technical in character – are characteristic of the society in which organizations are embedded and enter into the management practices of those organizations, becoming part of their overall culture. Although their work has not been widely cited within business-focused organizational studies, its argument has been central to that 'other' field of organizational studies focusing on public sector organizations, public administration (at least, as the disciplines are divided in the US academy), especially within its interpretive and critical scholarship (on this point see, e.g., Yanow 2007), which is our rationale for including it here.

Further exploring the 'dark side' of organizational culture and human action, Barbara Gray, Michel G. Bougon, and Anne Donnellon (vol. I, #25) ask about 'the meaning of meaning,' raising questions about not only its durability, but also its precariousness, and noting that organizational actions can also destroy meaning, in addition to creating it.

VIII. Writing organizational culture

The philosophical shift toward a constructivist ontology fostered the opportunity to engage epistemological questions, asking how knowledge claims were generated and how research processes themselves might create the social realities that were being studied. If theories were understood as no longer mirroring nature (Rorty 1979), then one might ask, as well, about the role of research writing itself in constructing ideas about the social worlds being described. Anthropologists had started doing this, as noted above, and the inquiry entered into studies of organizational writings from a methodological angle (e.g., Brower, Abolafia, and Carr 2000, Golden-Biddle and Locke 1993, 1997, Hatch 1996, Van Maanen 1995).

Barbara Czarniawska[-Joerges] (vol. I, #26) engaged this focus on the textual production of social realities in asking how budgets give accounts – reflect narratives, tell stories – of what is happening in an organization. Providing a semiotic reading of budgets raises another aspect of the ways in which managers make arguments for their organizations through the texts they author. While that observation may have been commonplace with respect to annual reports and other 'narrative' organizational documents, her work calls attention to the role of numbers in telling stories (see also Stone 1988).

Much as John Van Maanen had called attention to the ways in which classical anthropological writings told 'tales of the field,' the authors of three influential works of organizational culture were invited to consider how their written accounts narrated tales of the organizational culture field. Linda Smircich's comments (vol. I, #27), delivered at that Academy of Management symposium, provide not only an assessment of the works themselves from the perspective of their writing, but focus reflective attention on the field of organizational culture itself and on the ways in which scholars' words themselves construct the organizational realities that they purport to describe.

VOLUME II. BEYOND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PER SE

Although organizational culture gained a pronounced position in the organizational studies field, the excitement about the 'new concept', the 'new managerial method' or the 'new paradigm' inevitably faded. As early as 1987 some even called it 'dead' (Calás and Smircich 1987). This may have been something of an exaggeration at the time, given that publications continued unabated well into the 1990s, but in one view it was prescient. Although culture is still prominent in textbooks and both the Deal and Kennedy, and Peters and Waterman volumes have appeared in new editions (in 2000 and 2004, respectfully, the latter as a 'Harper Business Essentials' volume), very few journal articles today engage in the analysis of 'organizational culture'.

At the same time, while culture as an analytic concept seems to have lost some, if not all, of its early shine, we find its influence in organizational studies to have been broader and much longer-lasting. It is as if scholars had cracked opened a toy-box and started playing with all that was in there: metaphors and other language forms, sensemaking, artifacts, identity, institutions, aesthetics, and other concepts that were central to its

concerns are still very much in use today. Attention to organizational culture, especially for the community of critical management thinkers that emerged in the 1990s, seems to have gained depth in the sense that the concept of culture has become more or less taken-for-granted, its concerns refocused on studies of meaning (storytelling, discourse analysis) and its symbolic manifestations (talk, texts, acts, built space and other physical artifacts), as well as the different forms and arenas in which ‘cultural diversity’ is present in organizational life. The second volume reflects that breadth of interest in meaning-making processes and other sorts of cultural issues in organizations, highlighting how cultural research has been undertaken at different levels of analysis (Part IX), from different perspectives (Part X), and with a wide-ranging variety in its focus on the symbolic dimensions of organizational life (Parts XI-XIII).

IX. Culture at different levels: National, occupational, and industry cultures

As the idea took root that ‘culture’ was neither monolithic nor singular, theorists began to explore the various ‘levels’ of organizational life at which cultural differences were, or might be, manifested. Geert Hofstede’s work can be credited for putting ‘national culture’ on the agenda. His well-known dimensions of national cultural differences, described in the early text presented here (vol. II, #28), and less-known dimensions of organizational cultural differences (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayiv, and Sanders 1990) contributed to the growth of interest in cultural issues in certain arenas within organizational studies, sensitizing academics and practitioners to the impact of national cultures on organizations operating in a globalizing world and contributing to the establishment of the field of cross-cultural management.

Hofstede’s work, which is representative of a positivist approach to studying culture, makes for a rather odd coupling with John Van Maanen and Stephen Barley (vol. II, #29). Van Maanen’s body of work epitomizes an approach that claims that ‘culture is not a conventional social science variable in the sense that it can immediately be observed, counted, dimensionalized, yoked to a set of norms, or directly manipulated’ (Van Maanen 1984: 243); and Barley’s follows suit. We have chosen to include both of these selections here in order to illustrate that the study of culture in organizational settings has been taken up at a variety of different levels (see, e.g., Sackmann 1997b) and in different social domains; that is, culture *in* organizations is not only about the culture(s) *of* organizations. Van Maanen and Barley’s study illustrates that certain professions or occupations may create particular sets of values, norms, and perspectives, which are sustained through certain task rituals, standards for behavior, and work codes. There are many studies that illustrate the strength of this type of analysis of occupational cultures, researching, for instance, policemen (e.g., Manning 1977, Van Maanen 1978), cooks (e.g., Fine 1996, Gomez et al. 2003), and executives and managers (e.g., Dalton 1959, Jackall 1989, Morrill 1995), along with the earlier Chicago School studies of doctors (Becker et al. 1961), fire fighters (Kaufman 1960), bureaucrats (Blau 1955, Crozier 1964), and the like. Contemporary practice-focused studies hold the potential to develop this line of inquiry (see, e.g., Nicolini et al. 2003).

At a mid-level between occupations and nations, other scholars have looked beyond organizational boundaries to the industry level to inquire into the possibilities that there might be cultural elements characterizing organizations operating within a single industry, such as wine or high-tech (e.g., Phillips 1994, Weiss and Delbecq 1987). Although we do not include any representatives of this engagement, because their influence on the field overall appears to be limited, we mention it because their focus is another indicator of the possibility of varieties of cultures and cultural influences operative in organizational life.

X. Culture from different perspectives: Climate, psychoanalysis, gender, postmodernism

Cultural analyses of organizational life also intersected with various arenas within and views on organizations, each of which had its own separate focus. One of these major areas was the field of organizational climate studies, which had a direct link to the attitude and behavior studies of the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research and, even before that, to the Hawthorne experiments (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939). Benjamin Schneider (here with Arnon E. Reichers; vol. II, #30), argued extensively that climate and culture were overlapping constructs that needed to be studied together (Schneider 1990).

Approaching the field of organizational culture from quite a different angle, Manfred Kets de Vries and Danny Miller (vol. II, #31) drew on psychoanalytic insights and typologies of neurotic styles to characterize dysfunctional top executives. Using evocative (and somewhat loaded, emotionally charged) terms like ‘compulsive’, ‘depressive’, ‘dramatic’, ‘paranoid’, and ‘schizoid’, they typified managers’ excessive use of one particular neurotic style and the concomitant ‘organizational pathology’ that evolved from that style to characterize the organization as a whole. Such an approach is significant for those who, like these authors, assume

that top managers have the strongest impact on shaping the cultures of the organizations they lead. (For a different approach to translating psychoanalysis to the study of organizational culture, see Gabriel 1991.)

Albert Mills drew attention to the absence of gender in organizational analysis, suggesting that organizations are important contributors to the maintenance and development of gendered relationships. Here (vol. II, #32), he argues for the utility of an organizational cultural focus rooted in a feminist materialist approach for understanding gender. Silvia Gherardi (vol. II, #33), by contrast, treats gender as a symbolic order, investigating its discursive, cultural production within organizational life and asking whether 'gender' might be done differently, and if so, how. Her comments on symbolic approaches touch on the shift in research methods necessitated to produce a situated understanding of organizational practices, including cultural ones.

Postmodernist perspectives, represented here by Stephen Linstead and Robert Grafton-Small (vol. II, #34) and Paul Jeffcutt (vol. II, #35), can be read as a commentary on prevailing views on organizational culture in both the managerialist and the academic literatures. Drawing attention to what they consider to be neglected issues throughout the field (e.g., power, ideology, irrationality, subjectivity), Linstead and Grafton-Small explore the implications of a postmodernist approach for the analysis of organizational culture, introducing some alternative conceptualizations and emphasising the 'interweaving of a variety of "texts" and textual features' (p. 332). In a similar vein, Jeffcutt suggests moving away from the analysis of culture as 'interpretation' to an analysis of symbolism and the narrative 'representation' of organizational realities.

XI. Organizational Symbolism: Forerunners

From the beginning, both corporate and organizational culture studies identified symbols as the ways in which cultural meanings were created, manifested, and communicated. This was in keeping with a hermeneutic philosophy which saw artifacts – initially, written texts; then, spoken language, physical objects, and acts (what Charles Taylor [1971] termed 'text analogues') as well – as the embodiment of human meaning. Organizational symbolism, although occupying a central position within organizational culture studies, has also taken on something of a life of its own, with its own edited collections (e.g., Gagliardi 1990, Pondy et al. 1983, Turner 1990, Rafaeli and Pratt 2006) and journal special issues. Many of its topical areas of study – humor, metaphor, stories and storytelling, for example – have developed into research fields in their own right.

As with the organizational culture field itself, organizational symbolism had its forerunners – articles that appeared occasionally, without any sense that they were part of a school of thought. We include four here that anticipated many later research efforts and publications.

The anthropologist Harrison M. Trice, later working together with his colleague Janice Beyer (e.g., vol. II, #47), published a stream of work focusing on rites, rituals, and ceremonies, joining this line of work with the field of organizational culture in their textbook (Trice and Beyer 1992). But Trice had started thinking about such things long before those publications, and we include here an early article co-authored with James Belasco and Joseph A. Alutto (vol. II, #36) which explores the ways in which the ceremonial aspects of personnel administrators' roles can contribute to organizational goal achievement.

The field of higher education spawned a number of studies of the cultures of schools, colleges, and universities (e.g., Bolman and Deal 1991). Among the forerunners is Burton R. Clark's article on organizational sagas (vol. II, #37), which inspired a rich lode of studies of narratives, stories, and storytelling. Clark focused on collective understandings of organizational histories and the ways in which these 'sagas' can foster bonds of loyalty among organizational members. Ian I. Mitroff and Ralph H. Kilmann's 'Stories Managers Tell' (vol. II, #38) extended this kind of approach to exploring the ways in which 'epic myths' facilitate a sense of the organization's unique identity. In a later article by the same title, Ralph P. Hummel (Hummel 1991) advanced the methodological argument that stories could be, and should be seen as, a scientifically valid source of evidence.

Closing out this section, John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan's article (vol. II, #39) looked at the relationship between organizational structures and the myths of the surrounding institutional environment, arguing that the more these overlapped, the more 'a logic of confidence and good faith' could be drawn on as a control mechanism, in lieu of more formal methods of control.

XII. Organizational symbolism: A topic to expand organizational analysis

Attention to organizational symbolism mushroomed at the same time that organizational culture was getting off the ground. Two foundational articles were both published in 1980. Thomas C. Dandridge, Ian Mitroff, and William F. Joyce (vol. II, #40) were the first to suggest that the study of symbolism could serve as a useful addition to the organizational analysis toolkit. Meryl Reis Louis (vol. II, #41), who also published important articles on organizational culture (e.g., Louis 1985), pointed out that socialization to an organization was one of

the initial processes through which organizational meanings were passed on to newcomers, commonly through symbolic means, a topic explored in less explicit ways by theorists of socialization (e.g., Van Maanen 1978, Van Maanen and Schein 1979).

The next two articles in this section further theorized about the role of symbolism in organizations. Barry A. Turner's 1986 essay (vol. II, #42) sought to stake out ground for this approach. Pasquale Gagliardi's introduction (vol. II, #43) to the edited collection *Symbols and Artifacts* (Gagliardi 1990) asks why physical objects, such as office and other built spaces and their furnishings, had not been much attended to in the organizational literature. His answer – that social science typically engages the intellect rather than mythos and, especially, pathos – remains an important argument even today (cf. the chapters in Rafaeli and Pratt 2006).

Lastly, Mats Alvesson and Per Olof Berg (vol. II, #44), in their 1992 textbook, traced a history of the intertwining of organizational culture and symbolism. In the section excerpted here, they show how different aspects of management – strategy, human resources, communication, change – rest on symbolic elements.

XIII. Symbolism: Empirical studies of language, acts, and objects

The types of artifacts treated in the organizational symbolism literature are wide-ranging. From the perspective that artifacts represent and thereby communicate their underlying meanings, it makes sense to group them in three broad categories of symbolic representations:

language: written, oral, and nonverbal, including texts and stories;

acts: rites, rituals, ceremonies, dramas; and

objects, or physical artifacts: built spaces and their design, furnishings, artwork, signage.

For analytic purposes these categories are usefully distinct, although in practice, they are intertwined: graduation ceremonies, for example, involve speeches and award diplomas – physical objects containing written words – to people who march across a stage and are greeted with a handshake (see, e.g., Dandridge et al. vol. II, #40; Jones 1996; Yanow 1996, 2000). We have included a selection from the vast array of articles engaging one or more of these elements.

Martha S. Feldman and James G. March (vol. II, #45) pose a challenge to rational choice theories that argue that information is sought and used in relation to its costs. The empirical evidence, they argue, suggests that there is a symbolic dimension to information use that rests on the social norms within which it is embedded.

Alan L. Wilkins (vol. II, #46), David M. Boje (vol. II, #47), and Yiannis Gabriel (vol. II, #48) have been among the most prolific theorists of stories and storytelling in organizations, with Gabriel's work being tied to psychoanalytic theories. Wilkins argued that stories, told informally, interact with more formal Human Resource Management systems to create cultures that support corporate strategies. By contrast, Boje's approach to storytelling is much less functionalist: he finds organizational stories to be marked by changeability and dynamism across the organization. They are also, in his view, often incomplete and frequently challenged and even reinterpreted by listeners. He treated stories as part of the way in which an organization is constituted and performed. Gabriel explored different stories relating the same incident and the various modes in which they constitute their subject. He situated storytelling practices in what he terms 'the unmanaged organization', a kind of emotional free-zone in which people let off steam, seek distraction, and engage in spontaneous activities. Organizational discourses, Gabriel argued, tend to privilege the control-resistance/subjugation dialectic at the expense of the unmanaged and unmanageable, a tendency that can also be discerned in the literature on culture management (e.g., Kunda vol. I, #14, Willmott vol. I, #15). In an attempt to sidestep an organizational politics view and engage with the psychology of organizational life, Gabriel argued that fantasy, expressed in stories, jokes, gossip, nicknames, and the like, offers individuals a way to escape, temporarily, the managed and controlling organization.

Harrison M. Trice and Janice M. Beyer (vol. II, #49), as noted above, published extensively on the roles of rites and ceremonies in organizational life. Here, they sought to distinguish these two concepts and provide a typology that would be useful for analyzing them in organizational contexts. Michael Rosen (vol. II, #50) focused attention on the dramaturgical side of organizational 'performances' in his studies of Christmas parties and, here, breakfast business meetings. He 'read' the meal, the type of food eaten, and the dress, as well as the speeches, to understand hierarchy, status, and power within the organization. Lastly, Per Olof Berg and Kristian Kreiner (vol. II, #51) were among the first to note the role that corporate architecture plays in matters of organizational identity. They noted that the acquisition of a building and its particular design can be used, symbolically, as totems, as packaging, and/or to signal status, potency, and even good taste.

Concluding note: On the selection of these texts

Constructing a canon for a disciplinary field is an interesting act of reality construction. In developing the outline for these two volumes and the selection of texts for each section, we were guided by our collective memory of the field as it unfolded in time. One of us drew on her own involvement, academically and personally, with various events (calls for papers, conferences, publications) from the perspective of the US as they unfolded at the time. The other two were among the first doctoral students and ‘staff’ (faculty, in US parlance) in a unique department in Europe that took as its focus the very topic of organizational culture, approached from an anthropological perspective under the guidance of Hans Tennekes and Wim Koot.

We had, then, to balance two key perspectives and challenges in selecting material that was ‘influential’ in the construction of the field known as ‘organizational culture’: assessing what was influential in the field of organizational studies, rather than in organizational anthropology; and assessing what was influential both in the US and in Europe, without excessively privileging one over the other. We share a methodological perspective, however, that belies our national-cultural and disciplinary divides, but which sets us collectively apart from a major stream within organizational culture: we take an ethnographic, phenomenological-hermeneutic, and critical approach to the subject, which biases us in favor of meaning-focused orientations. We have tried, however, to give a balanced sketch of the development of the field, including selections from scholarship that we would, in other circumstances, argue against.

We are fully cognizant, then, of the politics of selection at play here and the fact that such choices are always arbitrary. Even within these parameters, we might equally as well have chosen other selections. In the end, we had our students in mind, and our choices were often made with the thought that, were we teaching a course in organizational culture or advising doctoral students writing dissertations in this field, these are the books and articles to which we would direct them.

References

- Allaire, Yvan and Firsirotu, Mihaela E. (1984) Theories of organizational culture. *Organization Studies* 5 (3): 193-226.
- Alvesson, Mats (1993) *Cultural perspectives on organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvesson, Mats (2002) *Understanding organizational culture*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, Mats and Berg, Per Olof (1992) *Corporate culture and organizational symbolism*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Anthony, Peter (1994) *Managing organizational culture*. Buckinghamshire: Open University Press.
- Barley, Stephen R. and Kunda, Gideon (1992) Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37: 363-399.
- Barley, Stephen R., Meyer, Gordon W., and Gash, Debra C. (1988) Cultures of culture: Academics, practitioners and the pragmatics of normative control. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33: 24-60.
- Barney, Jay B. (1986) Organizational culture: Can it be a source of competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review* 11 (3): 656-665.
- Becker, Howard S., Geer, Blanche, Hughes, Everett C., and Strauss, Anselm (1961) *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas (1966) *The social construction of reality*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Blau, Peter M. (1955) *The dynamics of bureaucracy: A study of interpersonal relations in two government agencies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bolman, Lee G. and Deal, Terrence E. (1991) *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bormann, Ernest G. (1983) Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In Linda Putnam and Michael Pacanowsky, eds., *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 99-122.
- Brower, Ralph S., Abolafia, Mitchel Y., and Carr, Jered B. 2000. On improving qualitative methods in public administration research. *Administration and Society* 32: 363-397.
- Brown, Andrew (1995) *Organisational culture*. London: Pitman.
- Burrell, Gibson and Morgan, Gareth (1979) *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calás, Marta B. and Smircich, Linda (1991) Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization Studies* 12 (4): 567-601.
- Calás, Marta B. and Smircich, Linda (1993) Dangerous liaisons? Feminine in management meets globalisation. *Business Horizons* March-April: 73-83.
- Cameron, Kim S. and Quinn, Robert E. (1988) Organizational paradox and transformation. In R. E. Quinn and Kim S. Cameron (eds.) *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*, 1-18. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Clegg, Stewart, Kornberger, Martin, and Pitsis, Tyrone (2005) *Managing and organizations: An introduction to theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Clifford, James and Marcus, George E. (1986) *Writing culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1985) *The symbolic construction of community*. Chichester/London: Ellis Horwood/ Tavistock.

- Collinson, David (1992). Conclusion. In David Collinson, *Subjectivity, masculinity and workplace culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Crozier, Michel. (1964) *The bureaucratic phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, Barbara (1992) *Exploring complex organizations: A cultural perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dalton, Melville (1959) *Men who manage: Fusions of feeling and theory in administration*. New York: Wiley.
- Davis, Stanley M. (1984) *Managing corporate culture*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Deal, Terrence E. and Kennedy, Allen A. (1982) *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Delbridge, Rick (1998) *Life on the line in contemporary manufacturing: The workplace experience of lean production and the 'Japanese' model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fine, Gary Alan (1996) *Kitchens: The Culture of Restaurant Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frost, Peter J., Moore, Larry F., Louis, Meryl Reis, Lundberg, Craig C., and Martin, Joanne (eds.) (1985) *Organizational culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Frost, Peter J., Moore, Larry F., Louis, Meryl Reis, Lundberg, Craig C., and Martin, Joanne (eds.) (1991) *Reframing organizational culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gabriel, Yiannis (1991) Organizations and their discontents: A psychoanalytic contribution to the study of organizational culture. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27 (3): 318-336.
- Gagliardi, Pasquale (1986) The creation and change of organizational culture: A conceptual framework. *Organization Studies* 7 (2): 117-134.
- Gagliardi, Pasquale, ed. (1990) *Symbols and artifacts*. NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973) *The interpretation of cultures*. NY: Basic Books.
- Geertz, Clifford (1988) *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1974) *New rules of sociological method*. London: Hutchinson.
- Goffman, Erving (1983 [1959]) *De dramaturgie van het dagelijks leven* [The presentation of self in everyday life]. Utrecht: Bijleveld.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen, and Karen Locke. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization Science* 4: 595-616.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen, and Karen Locke. 1997. *Composing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Gomez, Marie-Léandre, Bouty, Isabelle, and Drucker-Godard, Carole (2003) Developing knowing in practice: Behind the scenes of haute cuisine. In Davide Nicolini, Silvia Gherardi, and Dvora Yanow, eds., *Knowing in organizations: A practice-based approach*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe, 100-25.
- Goodman, Nelson (1978) *Ways of world-making*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. (1954) *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. (1955) *Wildcat strike: A study of an unofficial strike*. London: Routledge/ Kegan Paul.
- Gowler, Dan and Legge, Karen (1983) The meaning of management, the management of meaning: A view from social anthropology. In M.J. Earl (ed.) *Perspectives on management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 99-233.
- Graham, Laurie (1995) Inside a Japanese transplant: A critical perspective. *Work and Occupations* 20 (2): 147-173.
- Gregory, Karen L. (1983) Native-view paradigms: Multiple cultures and culture conflicts in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 359-76.
- Greiner, Larry E. (1972) Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. *Harvard Business Review* 50(4) (July-August): 37-46.
- Grey, Chris (2005) *Studying organizations*. London: Sage.
- Handel, Michael (ed.) (2004) *The sociology of organizations: Classic, contemporary, and critical readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Handy, Charles B. (1985) *Understanding organizations*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Haraway, Donna (1988) Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of the partial perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14: 575-99.
- Harding, Sandra (1993) Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is 'strong objectivity'? In *Feminist Epistemologies*, eds. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, 49-82. New York: Routledge.
- Hatch, Mary Jo. 1996. The role of the researcher: An analysis of narrative position in organization theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 5: 359-374.
- Hatch, Mary Jo (1997) *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatch, Mary Jo and Cunliffe, Ann (2007) *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert H., Neuijen, Bram, Ohayiv, Denise Daval, and Sanders, Geert (1990) Measuring organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 286-316.
- Homans, George C. (1950) *The human group*. NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Hummel, Ralph P. (1991) Stories managers tell: Why they are as valid as science. *Public Administration Review* 51 (1): 31-41.
- Jackall, Robert (1989) *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Jaques, Elliott (1951) *The changing culture of a factory*. London: Tavistock.
- Jermier, John M., Slocum, John W., Jr., Fry, Louis W., and Gaines, Jeannie (1991) Organizational subcultures in a soft bureaucracy: Resistance behind the myth and façade of an official culture. *Organization Science* 2 (2): 170-194.
- Jones, Michael Owen (1988) In search of meaning: Using qualitative methods in research and application. In Jones, Michael O., Moore, Michael Dane and Snyder, Richard Christopher (eds.), *Inside organizations: Understanding the human dimension*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 31-48.
- Jones, Michael Owen (1996) *Studying organizational symbolism: What, how, why?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, Michael Owen, Moore, Michael Dane, and Snyder, Richard Christopher (eds.) (1988) *Inside organizations: Understanding the human dimension*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kaufman, Herbert (1960) *The forest ranger: A study in administrative behavior*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Kertzer, David I. (1988) *Ritual, politics and power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kilmann, Ralph H., Saxton, Mary J., Serpa, Roy, and Associates (1985) *Gaining control of the corporate culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Koot, Willem (1996) The rhetoric of synergy and the practice of increasing ethnic rivalry in organizations. In W. Koot, I. Sabelis and S. Ybema (eds.) *Contradictions in context: Puzzling over paradoxes in contemporary organizations*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 63-85.
- Koot, Willem, Sabelis, Ida and Ybema, Sierk (eds.) *Contradictions in context: Puzzling over paradoxes in contemporary organizations*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kunda, Gideon (1992) *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Linstead, Stephen, Grafton-Small, Robert, and Jeffcutt, Paul (eds.) (1996) *Understanding management*. London: Sage.
- Louis, Meryl Reis (1985) Organizations as culture-bearing milieux. In Peter J. Frost et al. (eds.) *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 73-93.
- Lucas, Rob (1987) Political-cultural analysis of organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 12: 144-156.
- Lundberg, Craig C. (1985) On the feasibility of cultural intervention. In Peter J. Frost et al., *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 169-185.
- Manning, Peter K. (1977) *Police work: The social organization of policing*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Martin, Joanne (1990) Breaking up the mono-method monopolies in organizational analysis. In John Hassard and D. Pym (eds.), *The theory and philosophy of organizations: critical issues and new perspectives*. London: Routledge, 30-43.
- Martin, Joanne (1992) *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, Joanne (2002) *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, Joanne and Meyerson, Debra (1988) Organizational culture and the denial, channelling and acknowledgment of ambiguity. In L. Pondy, R. Boland, and H. Thomas (Eds.), *Managing ambiguity and change*. New York: Wiley, 93-125.
- Martin, Joanne and Frost, Peter (1996) The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In Stewart R. Clegg, C. Hardy, and Walter Nord (eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*. London: Sage, 599-621.
- Martin, Joanne and Powers, Melanie E. (1983) Truth or corporate propaganda: The value of a good war story. In Louis R. Pondy et al. (eds.), *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Martin, Joanne and Siehl, Caren (1983) Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics* 12: 52-64.
- McGregor, Douglas (1960) *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meyerson, Debra and Martin, Joanne (1987) Cultural change: An integration of three different views. *Journal of Management Studies* 24: 623-647.
- Mitroff, Ian I. and Kilmann, Ralph H. (1976) Stories managers tell: a new tool for organizational problem solving. *Management Review* 64 (7): 18-28.
- Morey, Nancy C. and Luthans, Fred (1985) Refining the concept of culture and the use of scenes and themes in organizational studies. *Academy of Management Review* 10: 219-29.
- Morrill, Calvin (1995) *The executive way: Conflict management in corporations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, Gareth (1986) *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nahavandi, Afsaneh and Malekzadeh, Ali R. (1988) Acculturation in mergers and acquisitions. *Academy of Management Review* 13 (1): 79-90.
- Nicolini, Davide, Gherardi, Silvia, and Yanow, Dvora, eds. *Knowing in organizations: A practice-based approach*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.
- Ogbonna, Emmanuel and Wilkinson, Barry (1988) Corporate strategy and corporate culture: The view from the checkout. *Personnel Review* 19 (4): 9-15.
- Olson, Margrethe H. (1982) New information technology and organizational culture. *MIS Quarterly* 6: 71-92.
- Ouchi, William G. (1981) *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Parker, Martin (2000) *Organizational culture and identity*. London: Sage.
- Pascale, Richard Tanner and Athos, Anthony G. (1981) *The art of Japanese management*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Peters, Thomas J. and Waterman, Robert H. (1982) *In search of excellence*. NY: Harper and Row.

- Pettigrew, Andrew M. (1979) On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24: 570-581.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey (1981) *Power in organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Phillips, Margaret E. (1994) Industry Mindsets: Exploring the Cultures of Two Macro-Organizational Settings. *Organization Science* 5 (3): 384-402.
- Pondy, Louis R., Forst, Peter J., Morgan, Gareth, and Dandridge, Thomas C., eds. (1983) *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Quinn, Robert E. and McGrath, Michael R. (1985) The transformation of organizational cultures: A competing values perspective. In Peter J. Frost et al., *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 31-53.
- Rafaeli, Anat and Pratt, Michael G., eds. (2006) *Artifacts and organizations: Beyond mere symbolism*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reiches, Arnon E. and Schneider, Benjamin (1990) Climate and culture: an evolution of constructs. In Benjamin Schneider (ed.) *Organizational climate and culture*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Riley, Patricia (1983) A structurationist account of political cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 414-437.
- Rorty, Richard (1979) *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Roethlisberger, Fritz J. and Dickson, William J. (1939) *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roy, Donald (1954) Efficiency and "the fix": Informal intergroup relations in a piecework machine shop. *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (5): 427-442.
- Rosen, Michael (1986) Some notes from the field: On ethnography and organizational science. *Dragon* 6: 57-67.
- Sackmann, Sonja A. (1992) Culture and subcultures: An analysis of organizational knowledge. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37: 140-161.
- Sackmann, Sonja A., ed. (1997a) *Cultural complexity in organizations: Inherent contrasts and contradictions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sackmann, Sonja A. (1997b) Introduction. In Sonja A. Sackmann (ed.), *Cultural complexity in organizations: Inherent contrasts and contradictions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1-13.
- Sanders, Geert and Neuijen, Bram (1989) *Bedrijfscultuur, Diagnose en Beïnvloeding*. Assens: Van Gorcum.
- Satte, Vijay (ed.) (1985) *Culture and related corporate realities*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Schein, Edgar H. (1978) *Career Dynamics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schein, Edgar H. (1983) The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organization Dynamics* 12 (1): 13-28.
- Schein, Edgar H. (1985, 1992) *Organizational culture and leadership*, 1st and 2nd eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, Benjamin, ed. (1990) *Organizational culture and climate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, Susan C. and Barsoux, Jean-Louis (1997) *Managing across cultures*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Selznick, Philip (1949) *TVA and the grass roots*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Selznick, Philip (1957) *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Corbally, John E. (eds.) (1984) *Leadership and organizational culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Shafritz, Jay M. and Ott, J. Steven (1996) *Classics of organization theory*, 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Shafritz, Jay M., Ott, J. Steven, and Jang, Yong Suk (2004) *Classics of organization theory*, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sharpe, Diana Rosemary (1997) Managerial control strategies and subcultural processes: On the shop floor in a Japanese manufacturing organization in the United Kingdom. In S.A. Sackmann (ed.) *Cultural complexity in organizations: Inherent contrasts and contradictions*. London: Sage, 228-251.
- Smircich, Linda (1983) Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 339-358.
- Smircich, Linda and Morgan, Gareth (1982) Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 18: 257-273.
- Smircich, Linda and Stubbart, Charles (1985) 'Strategic management in an enacted world. *Academy of Management Review* 10: 724-736.
- Stone, Deborah A. (1988) *Policy paradox and political reason*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Tennekes, Hans (1990) *De onbekende dimensie: over cultuur, cultuurverschillen en macht* [The unknown dimension: On culture, culture differences and power]. Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.
- Tennekes, Hans (1995) *Organisatiecultuur: Een antropologische visie* [Organizational culture: An anthropological view], Garant, Leuven/Apeldoorn.
- Trice, Harrison M. and Beyer, Janice M. (1993) *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Turner, Barry A. (1971) *Exploring the industrial subculture*. New York: Macmillan.
- Turner, Barry A., ed. (1990). *Organizational symbolism*. NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Van Maanen, John (1978) Observations on the making of a policeman. *Human Organization* 32: 407-18.
- Van Maanen, John (1979) The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24: 539-550.
- Van Maanen, John (1983) *Qualitative methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, John (1984) Doing new things in old ways: The chains of socialization. In James L. Bess (ed.) *College and university organization*. New York: New York University Press.
- Van Maanen, John (1988) *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Van Maanen, John. 1995. Style as theory. *Organization Science* 6: 133B43.
- Van Maanen, John, ed. (1998) *Qualitative studies of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, John and Barley, Stephen R. (1985) Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In P.J. Frost et al., *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 31-53.
- Van Maanen, John and Schein, Edgar H. (1979) Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 1: 209-264.
- Weiss, Joseph and Delbecq, Andre (1987) High-technology cultures and management: Silicon Valley and Route 128. *Group & Organization Management* 12: 39-54.
- Whyte, William Foote (1948) *Human relations in the restaurant industry*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilkins, Alan H. (1983) Organizational stories as symbols which control the organization. In Louis R. Pondy et al. (eds.) *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Willmott, Hugh (1993) Strength is ignorance, slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies* 30 (4): 515-552.
- Woodward, Joan (1970) *Industrial organization: Behaviour and control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yanow, Dvora (1993) Controlling cultural engineering? *Journal of Management Inquiry* 2 (2): 206-13.
- Yanow, Dvora (1996) *How does a policy mean? Interpreting policy and organizational actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, Dvora (2000) *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yanow, Dvora (2007) Power, politics, and science in the study of complex organizations. *International Public Management Journal* 10 (2): 173-89.
- Ybema, Sierk (1996) A duckbilled platypus in the theory and analysis of organisations: Combinations of consensus and dissensus. In W. Koot, I. Sabelis and S. Ybema (eds.) *Contradictions in Context. Puzzling over Paradoxes in Contemporary Organizations*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 39-61.
- Ybema, Sierk (1997) Telling tales. Contrasts and commonalities within the organization of an amusement park: confronting and combining different perspectives. In S.A. Sackmann (ed.) *Cultural complexity in organizations: Inherent contrasts and contradictions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 160-185.